

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action dated October 1, 2007, the Examiner indicates that the rejection of Claim 5 is maintained. Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks contained herein.

In the final Office Action dated May 21, 2007, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 21,536. Specifically, EP 21,536 is relied upon to teach silicate phosphors and their use in low-pressure mercury vapor lamps. In this regard, it is asserted that the low-pressure mercury vapor lamp taught in EP 21,536 is a vacuum ultraviolet radiation exciting device. See, page 2 of the Final Office Action dated May 21, 2007.

Although Applicants believe that the difference between present Claim 5 and EP 21,536 was explained sufficiently in the responses filed April 30, 2007 and September 21, 2007, Applicants wish to explain the difference further by referencing an excerpt from the Phosphor Handbook.

Appellants respectfully submit that EP 21,536 fails to disclose all of the features recited in Claim 5 because EP 21,536 fails to disclose a vacuum ultraviolet radiation excited light-emitting device.

EP 21,536 discloses a low pressure mercury vapor discharge lamp which is excited under radiation of ultraviolet ray having a wavelength of 254 nm. See, page 3, lines 14-16 of the EP 21,536 specification. The low-pressure mercury vapor discharge lamp is not a vacuum ultraviolet radiation exciting device.

The Examiner in the Advisory Action asserts that a low pressure Hg vapor lamp emits light having a wavelength of about 254 nm and is a vacuum ultraviolet excited light-emitting

device. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023670 and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0072093 are cited to support the Examiner's position.

However, in the present application the term "vacuum ultraviolet light" refers to a light with a wavelength of about 0.2 to 200 nm. See page 727, chapter 14.6, line 1 of Phosphor Handbook attached hereto.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 18, 2008


John T. Callahan
Registration No. 32,607